



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

KL
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/853,289	05/09/2001	Myung-Lae Lee	51876p244	6039

8791 7590 05/22/2002

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

KIM, RICHARD H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2882

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/853,289

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Richard H Kim

Art Unit

2882

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 May 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show labels 100, 200, 300 and 320 as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scobey (U.S. 5,786,915), in view of Durand et al. (4,377,324).

Scobey discloses an optical filter comprising a fixed mirror including a number of first erecting plates; a mirror including a number of second erecting plates; and a gap disposed between both mirrors (see Fig. 6). However, the reference does not disclose the mirror including a number of second erecting plates as being movable and an air gap disposed between the fixed

Art Unit: 2882

mirror and the movable mirror, wherein an actuator reciprocating the movable mirror for changing the width of the air gap.

Durand et al. discloses two mirrors, and an air gap disposed there between, wherein the air gap's width is adjustable by an actuator (see Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 23-40).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Scobey to include an air gap between both mirrors, wherein one mirror is fixed and the second mirror is adjustable by an actuator to change the width of the air gap since Durand et al. states in column 2, lines 41-43, that such a modification would enable the percentage of light transmitted through the filter to be adjusted with the air gap, thereby adding versatility to the device

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scobey and Durand et al., as applied to claim 1, further in view of Kubota et al. (U.S. 4,751,509) and Scott (U.S. 6,160,834)

Scobey and Durand et al. disclose the optical tunable filter previously recited. However, the references do not disclose the optical tunable filter wherein each of the erecting plates are made of silicon and has a thickness determined but the equation, $(2m+1)\lambda/4n$, and the air gap has a width determined by an equation of $(2m+1)\lambda/4$.

Scott discloses erecting plates made of silicon (see col. 11, lines 15-20). Further, Kubota et al. disclose a thickness determined by the equation $(2m+1)\lambda/4n$ (see col. 4, line 51).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Scobey and Durand et al. such that the tunable

Art Unit: 2882

filter includes erecting plates made of silicon since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416, and further for silicon's insulating properties. Moreover, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time was made to modify the teachings of Scobey and Durand et al. in order for the tunable filter comprise of erecting plates with a thickness determined by the equation $(2m+1)\lambda/4n$, since such an equation is known in the art to determine the thickness of a structure, given the wavelength and the refractive index of a material. It is noted by the examiner that the refractive index of air is known to be approximately one, yielding the equation $(2m+1)\lambda/4$ for the width of the air gap.

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scobey and Durand et al., as applied to claim 1, further in view of Soares (U.S. 6,212,292 B1).

Scobey and Durand et al. disclose the optical tunable filter recited above. However, the references do not disclose the apparatus wherein the moveable mirror further includes a sacrificial oxide layer formed below the second erecting plates.

Soares discloses a sacrificial oxide layer (see col. 4, lines 51-54).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to include a sacrificial oxide layer disposed below the second erecting plates in order to protect the substrate from "damage that might otherwise occur from repetitive use" as disclose by Soares in column 4, lines 51-54, such as movement from the mirror.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scobey and Durand et al., as applied to claim 1, further in view of Tam (U.S. 5,990,769).

Scobey and Durand et al. disclose the tunable optical filter previously recited. However, the references do not disclose that the actuator includes a fixed electrode and a moveable electrode, the fixed electrode being mechanically connected to the moveable electrode with an elastic member intervening therebetween and the moveable electrode being mechanically coupled with the moveable mirror.

Tam discloses an actuator including an electrode mechanically connected by an elastic member to a moveable electrode (see col. 1, lines 51-64).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching to Scobey and Durand et al. to include an actuator which includes a fixed electrode and a moveable electrode, the fixed electrode being mechanically connected to the moveable electrode with an elastic member intervening therebetween and the moveable electrode being mechanically coupled with the moveable mirror, in order to induce a voltage difference between the electrode connection, while having controlled and restricted movement via the elastic connection, thereby inducing controlled and restricted movement of the moveable mirror.

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scobey, Durand et al., and Tam, as applied to claim 4, further in view of Fujita et al. (U.S. 4,887,109).

Scobey, Durand et al. and Tam disclose the apparatus previously recited. Tam further discloses a leaf spring disposed between two contacts (see col. 1, lines 52-55). Fujita et al.

Art Unit: 2882

discloses a link lever disposed adjacent to a spring, and proximate to an actuating device (see col. 4, lines 59-63).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Scobey, Durand et al., and Tam to have the device include a silicon leaf spring as the elastic member and a link lever intervening between the leaf spring and the moveable electrode in order for the leaf spring to urge the two electrodes into a first position and a second position, as disclosed in col. 1, lines 52-64, which would cause the mirror to move. Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the device include a silicon leaf spring as the elastic member and a link lever intervening between the leaf spring and the moveable electrode in order for the link lever to decrease the elasticity of the leaf spring, since the link lever is a strictly rigid and inelastic element. Moreover, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the leaf spring made of silicon, since it is known in the art that silicon is an effective insulator and would guard against excessive heat transfer from one electrode to the other.

7. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scobey in view of Durand et al.

Scobey discloses a communication device for demultiplexing/multiplexing various wavelengths, comprising an input optical fiber, a number of output optical fibers, and an array of optical filters, wherein the optical filter is regularly arranged to correspond to one input/output optical fiber (see Fig. 2-3, and col. 10, lines 35-44). Scobey further discloses an optical filter

Art Unit: 2882

comprising a fixed mirror including a number of first erecting plates; a mirror including a number of second erecting plates; and a gap disposed between both mirrors (see Fig. 6). However, the reference does not disclose the mirror including a number of second erecting plates as being movable and an air gap disposed between the fixed mirror and the movable mirror, wherein an actuator reciprocating the movable mirror for changing the width of the air gap.

Durand et al. discloses two mirrors, and an air gap disposed there between, wherein the air gap's width is adjustable by an actuator (see Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 23-40).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Scobey to include an air gap between both mirrors, wherein one mirror is fixed and the second mirror is adjustable by an actuator to change the width of the air gap, Durand et al. states in column 2, lines 41-43, that such a modification would enable the percentage of light transmitted through the filter to be adjusted with the air gap, thereby adding versatility to the device.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard H Kim whose telephone number is (703)305-4791. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H Kim can be reached on (703)305-3492. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-7722 for regular communications and (703)308-7724 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/853,289
Art Unit: 2882

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.

Richard H Kim
Examiner
Art Unit 2882

R.K.
May 16, 2002


ROBERT H. KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800